# GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

BUILDING CODE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

COMMITTEE MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY

OCTOBER 17, 2007

+ + + + +

The meeting convened in Room 220 South, 441 4<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, pursuant to notice at 10:00 a.m., Jerrily Kress, Chairperson, presiding.

BUILDING CODE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

JERRILY KARESS Chairperson

MARC FETTERMAN Vice-Chairperson ESTHER BUSHMAN General Counsel

REBECCA MESTEMACHER DCOZ ROBERT MCDANIEL NTA

BELLUR RAVISHANKAR DCRA/BLRA
JOAN STOGIS DC/AIA
DENNIS ANIBABA DCRA
JOHN DEVLIN SFPE

MILES HABER M-NCBIA ARTHUR LEABMAN DCCHA

SYNDEY LESTER DCRA/BLRA

MARC FIEDLER DRCGW SAMANTHA MCASKILL ASID T. MADDOX-LEVINE DCRA

MOHAMMED ALI DCRA/BLRA

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 PRESENT: (CONT.)

SARA BARDIN DCOZ

DENVERT BONEY DCRA/BLRA

LESTER CLEMONS NTA

SEAN CRUIKSHANK

DONALD GALLOWAY DCRA/BPLA

JAMES LOWERY IUEC

GAIL MONTPLAISIR AU/Taurus Devel

Group

MOHSIN SIDDIQUE DCWASA
JOHN STOVALL M-NCBIA
MIKE THOMPSON SFPE

RONNIE LOUIS WORRELL EMS
GREGORY ZAHN Zahn 1

GORY ZAHN Zahn Design Architects, PC

## AGENDA

		Page
Plumbing		5
Structures	13	
Existing Structures		17
Accessibility		47
Fire and Life Safety		62
Issues and Policy		71
Additional Business		72

## PROCEEDINGS

10:24 a.m.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Good morning, everyone. I'm sorry to be so late in convening this meeting. I'm Marc Fetterman, the Vice Chair of the Building Code Advisory Committee, and I'll call our meeting to order today on October 17<sup>th</sup>.

Over there at the door in addition to the sign-in sheet is a detailed agenda showing what we may be able to get through today.

Perhaps, Bellur, may we start with the plumbing, and why don't you join me up here at a microphone, and we will go through the Plumbing Amendments 1 through 6 which are Xeroxed at the door and will be available on the website within a day or so. We'll send an electronic copy to you.

I'm sorry we just got a number of issues clarified at the very last second, but

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	I didn't want to delay this important set of
2	amendments.
3	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Hi, good
4	morning, Bellur Ravishankar from DCRA
5	representing Sir John Puchala who is the Chair
6	of the Subcommittee.
7	We'll be introducing Amendments 1
8	through 6 as Marc mentioned. All of these
9	have been carried forward from the previous
10	amendments. There's nothing new here except I
11	would like to make a small correction on
12	Number 1, the Section P-301.3.1, the last
13	part.
14	It says as approved by the
15	administrative authority. Please scratch that
16	out and say as approved by D.C. Water and
17	Sewer Authority, and the same thing for the
18	next paragraph, as approved by D.C. Water and
19	Sewer Authority.
20	I would like to make a motion to
21	adopt Amendment Number 1.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank

1	you. Do we have a second to the motion?
2	MR. MCDANIEL: Second
3	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
4	you. I'm sorry, can you repeat your name. My
5	memory is going with my hair.
6	MR. MCDANIEL: Robert McDaniel.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
8	you very much, Robert.
9	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: That's a new
10	one.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Robert
12	McDaniel has seconded. Do we have any
13	discussion on P1? Seeing none, we'll the
14	question, all members who are sworn in
15	hopefully have a yellow card, and all those
16	with the yellow card may vote, so if you're in
17	favor of Amendment 1, please raise your yellow
18	card.
19	Thank you, all opposed. I see
20	none - you're not opposing it, right? Any
21	abstentions? I see none, the motion carries.
22	Thank you.

1	There seem to be two Number 1's.
2	MR. RAVISHANKAR: I'm sorry, this
3	should be - yes, there's a numbering -
4	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Should
5	we go to Number 2 then, and this is the last
6	one?
7	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Yes, sure, sure.
8	The next one is grounding electrical systems
9	in existing structures. I would like to make
10	a motion to adopt this.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
12	you, do I have a second? Thank you, Jim
13	Lowery is seconding it. Any discussion on P-2
14	which is Section 305.10. Seeing none, we'll
15	call the question. All those in favor, please
16	raise your yellow card.
17	All opposed. All abstentions.
18	The motion carries. Thank you.
19	MR. RAVISHANKAR: The next is
20	Amendment Number 3. We are just adding new
21	sections regarding trench locations and trench
22	safeguards. I would like to make a motion to

1 adopt these. 2 VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank 3 Do I have a second? Joan Stogis. you. Seeing none, we'll call 4 Discussion on P-3? 5 the question. All those in favor, please 6 raise your yellow card. Thank you. All opposed, and any 7 abstentions? Thank you. The motion carries. 8 we have a microphone 9 Yes, 10 Sydney. Sydney Lester, DCRA. 11 MR. LESTER: Are you saying that the second Number 1 is to 12 13 be omitted totally? CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: 14 VICE No, 15 (silence) later if it's already been 16 introduced we can vote on it today. Thank you. Sydney Lester asked a question about the 17 second Number 1 and Marc 18 status of the 19 Fetterman and Bellur replied that we hoped to 20 get to it today. Thank you Number 4 is next. 21 MR. RAVISHANKAR: Have we voted on 22

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Yes, we passed it.

Number 3?

1	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Okay, thank you.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN:
3	Congratulations.
4	MR. RAVISHANKAR: The next one is
5	Amendment Number 4. We're just deleting some
6	materials from the table, P-604.2.4. I would
7	like to make a motion to adopt this please.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
9	you. Do I have a second. Thank you,
LO	Mohammed. We will second it. Any discussion
11	on P-4? Seeing none, we'll call the question.
12	All those in favor, please raise the yellow
13	card. All opposed. Any abstentions? The
L 4	motion carries. Thank you.
15	MR. RAVISHANKAR: The next one is
L6	Amendment Number 5. I would like to make a
L7	motion to adopt this please.
L 8	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
L9	you Do I have a second on P-5? Thank you,
20	Robert McDaniel. Any discussion on P-5?
21	Seeing none, we call the question.
22	All those in favor, please raise the yellow

1	card. All opposed. Any abstentions? The
2	motion carries. Thank you.
3	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Number P-6, I'd
4	like to make a motion to adopt this. This is
5	just the introduction of new material into the
6	code that was approved by ICC 2007 Supplement.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
8	you. Do I have a second to P-6? Thank you.
9	I'm sorry I didn't get to see your full face
10	behind Sydney. Thank you. Any discussion on
11	P-6? Seeing, none, we'll call the question.
12	All those in favor, please raise the yellow
13	card. Thank you. All opposed, any
14	abstentions? Seeing none opposed, no
15	abstentions, the motion carries. Thank you.
16	MR. RAVISHANKAR: I would like to
17	introduce I hope I think this was introduced
18	the last time, renumber the amendment to read
19	P-7.
20	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: This is
21	the - on the back of the first page, and we're
22	amending Section 301.8.

1	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: It's now
2	going to be called -
3	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: And it's
4	now going to be P-7, and a question we're
5	raising, has this amendment been previously
6	introduced? Joan.
7	MS. STOGIS: It was - Joan Stogis
8	- it was included in this unnumbered set that
9	were introduced, I don't know, a couple of
10	months ago.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
12	you.
13	MS. STOGIS: So I think what's
14	happened is simply it's been broken into
15	pieces and renumbered.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: So were
17	there seven as part of that unnumbered set?
18	MS. STOGIS: Well -
19	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: I just
20	want to make sure that we're -
21	MS. STOGIS: I believe the content
22	was previously introduced. The numbering

1	system has changed.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
3	you. Plus as Bellur is seeing, we're carrying
4	forward elements that we voted on a couple of
5	years ago. Thank you.
6	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Thank you,
7	Stogis. Excuse me. I would like to make a
8	motion to introduce first.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
10	you, P-7, do I have a second to P-7? I'm
11	sorry, you need a - thank you for your help.
12	MR. LEABMAN: Art Leabman.
13	Amendment 1, it's Page 1 and Page 2, and it's
14	still Section 301, so I think it was really
15	part of Amendment 1.
16	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Okay, sorry,
17	then we -
18	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: I'm
19	willing to accept that if that's the sense of
20	the rest of the Committee. Thank you very.
21	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Then we'll make
22	it as part of P-1 itself.

1	MR. LEABMAN: It's Page 2 of P-1.
2	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Yes, Page 2 of
3	P-1. I'm going to ask for a vote again.
4	We're going to vote on Page 2.
5	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
6	you, I believe that concludes the plumbing
7	amendments. I know it's been a struggle on
8	the plumbing end, and I thank Denvert and
9	Bellur and Milton and the others that -
10	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Mr. Carter and
11	the rest of the group.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Mr.
13	Carter and the others that tried to get this
14	through, and your patience has been wonderful.
15	Thank you.
16	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Thank you.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Do I
18	have anyone here from Structural? Seeing
19	none, I have gone - I'm comfortable with
20	introducing and discussing structural
21	amendments P-1 through P-7, and I don't have

the expertise to discuss P-8, and maybe

1	somebody can help me or we can defer that, but
2	what I would like to do is to introduce and
3	vote on the structural amendments, very
4	similar to what Bellur Ravishankar said with
5	regard to the plumbing amendments.
6	P-1 through P-7 are holdovers from
7	the existing code in effect, and we're also
8	pastoring the last code cycle that did not
9	result in a building code being adopted by the
10	City.
11	So I would like to move adoption
12	of S-1 and do I have a second?
13	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Or do you
14	want to do them jointly?
15	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: I'd be
16	happy to do them jointly if that's the sense
17	of the Committee to go $S-1$ through $S-7$ , and
18	maybe I'd give everyone a minute to -
19	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Give them a
20	minute.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: To look
22	at these controversial items, and I'll pull

1 any of them out if we want to vote on them 2 individually. 3 CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Does that go with your hair falling out? 4 5 VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Yes, it 6 does, thank you. Thank you for reminding me. 7 Does anyone need some more time to look at I'd be happy to give it to you, but I 8 don't want to belabor the point. 9 10 I'd like to make a motion to accept amendments S-1, S-2, S-3, S-4, S-5, S-11 6, and S-7. Do I have a second, 12 13 Vandame. Do I have any discussion on these amendments? Thank you. 14 15 Thank you I'm making a motion to 16 accept amendments 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7. Thank you very much. 17 18 You're okay with that revised 19 amendment, Scott. Thank you. So I have a 20 motion and accepted. Any discussion? none, I'll call the question. All those in 21 22 favor of these amendments, please raise your

1 yellow card. 2 All opposed, Thank you. see 3 Any abstentions? I see none. The none. motion carries. 4 Thank you. 5 On S-8 I am unqualified to speak 6 about the need for this amendment and would be 7 happy to turn it over to someone else who is able to discuss this or we kind of wait, 8 from the Structural Committee 9 someone 10 address this issue, and we'll vote on it at a subsequent meeting if no one steps forward to 11 strongly support the amendment. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Take a minute and take a look. It may be one we don't need. 14 15 Jerrily Karess. 16 CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Jerrily 17 Karess, I'm sorry. VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: 18 Seeing 19 no one willing to help on this, let's defer 20 and I will get in touch with Howard this,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Gibbs and ask him to join us at a subsequent

meeting if he feels this is an important one

21

1	to include in the 12 DCMR. Thank you all.
2	That concludes the Structural
3	Amendments presentation for today.
4	Joan, may I invite existing
5	structures amendments.
6	MS. STOGIS: Joan Stogis
7	representing DC/AIA and Chair of the Existing
8	Structures Subcommittee. These are kind of a
9	mixed bag of amendments. I gather copies have
10	been made available.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: There
12	are copies at the door if anyone needs them.
13	MS. STOGIS: And I believe the
14	first one is EX 3-3. This amendment
15	incorporates several changes to Chapter 3 of
16	existing building code from the ICC 2007
17	Supplement.
18	I'll say this in general because
19	some other include this. There were about 12
20	pages of changes in the supplement. The
21	Subcommittee picked out a few which we thought
22	were particularly relevant to construction in

the District and where we felt it would be helpful to have them in this code cycle and not wait for the next one.

The reason for these, I believe, is that ICC in its wisdom created this new Chapter 3 of prescriptive compliance method and then realized they left a few things out, so in effect these are all things that appear in other parts of existing building code but because Chapter 3 is a separate path they need to state them here too.

I'd like to move the adoption of amendment EX 3-3.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank you. Do I have a second? Jim Lowery is seconding it. Discussion on 3-3? Seeing none, we'll call the question. All those in favor please - I have discussion, and I have a microphone, and it is - don't touch the buttons.

MR. RAVISHANKAR: Bellur Ravishankar, DCRA. I just would like to ask

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	for clarification when you say when it is
2	technically feasible.
3	MS. STOGIS: What part are you?
4	MR. RAVISHANKAR: I'm sorry,
5	Section 308.6, change to read as shown. Where
6	compliance with this section is technically
7	infeasible, the alteration shall provide
8	access to the maximum extent technically
9	feasible. What exactly does it mean?
10	MS. STOGIS: That's a standard
11	phrase in accessibility code, and I'm looking
12	at Samantha who probably can define it more
13	precisely that I, but my recollection is that
14	it has to do with not having to disturb any
15	structural members.
16	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Can that be
17	specific somewhere, somehow or -
18	MS. STOGIS: If we did it there, I
19	think we would want to do it all through
20	accessibility language throughout the code.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: And this
22	is part of the existing model code today.

let's

a –

1	MS. STOGIS: Yes, it is. That's
2	not proposed to be changed. The underlined
3	exceptions are the changes that came out in
4	the 2007 supplement.
5	MR. HABER: Miles Haber, I believe
6	the reason technically and feasible is in
7	there is because of wording in both ADA and

somewhat ambiguous position, but I don't think

11 we can change the laws.

the

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

put

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: As well as the designer. It puts - the whole team has to interpret.

the Fair Housing Amendments Act, and it does

code official in

MR. HABER: And designers, yes, right. It's basically a consensus of what can really be done, and a lot of it has to do with - came in because historic structures, how do you improve accessibility but still maintain the - and here is the expert who could tell us about it.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank

1 you, you okay with that explanation, 2 Thank you. I share your concern, but Bellur? 3 I don't know how to solve it either. It's a problem we're 4 MS. STOGIS: 5 dealing with nationally not a D.C., to the 6 extent that it is a problem. 7 VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Marc, we were talking about the definition of 8 the word technically feasible and technically 9 10 infeasible, and we decided to postpone the discussion on that. 11 discussion 3 - 3? 12 more on Any 13 Seeing none, we're call the question. All those in favor, please raise your yellow card. 14 15 opposed? Thank you, sorry, any Any 16 abstentions? The motion carries. Thank you 17 very much. 18 MS. STOGIS: The next amendment is 19 EΧ 3 - 4. After this group approved the 20 18 of the sustainable Amendment for sustainable buildings last time I realized 21

that we needed to have some cross references

to guide a person from the existing buildings code over to Chapter 13 of the building code when appropriate and identified three places where this should happen.

This Amendment 3-4 is the first one. This is again Chapter 3 is the prescriptive compliance method, and if alteration using that path were big enough to substantial improvement, constitute а that would - could potentially bring in some sustainable design requirements.

I'd like to move the adoption of Amendment EX 3-4.

CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Ι VICE Do have a second, Bellur. Do I have discussion on 3-4? Seeing none, I'll call the question. All those in favor please raise your yellow Thank All opposed. card. you. Any abstentions? One abstention I note. The Thank you very much. motion carries.

MS. STOGIS: Okay, the next amendment I believe is EX 7-9. This is an

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

amendment that - we're now into Level 2 alterations, and on the proposal form where it says Section Number it should say 705.11 not Section 711.

I would like to move adoption of this amendment with the deletion of the last subsection, 705.11.1. The reason for the deletion is conferring with John Devlin that once we looked at amendments which have been approved coming from the Fire and Life Safety Committee, it appeared that the situation in this subparagraph was already covered and we didn't need it.

This Exit Access - so what is left 705.11, Exit Access Travel Distance, picks up in Group B occupancies, maximum length of travel as we have it in the 1999 D.C. Supplement, and we felt that this does represent conditions have in D.C. we our older office particularly in some of buildings with these very super compact corridors with their scissor stairs that we

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

needed to give a little more room.

The Exception Number 2 for our two occupancies. Again, this is a condition that we find in D.C., and the numbers of 100 feet without an automatic sprinkler system and 200 feet with a sprinkler system I'm told is based on NFPA similar provisions.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank you. Do I have a - you're making this as a motion.

MS. STOGIS: I'm making this as motion but with the deletion of the last subparagraph, 705.11.1.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank you. Do I have a second? Art Leabman is seconding it. Do I have discussion? I had a question while people are thinking about this.

With the help of Joan and John Devlin and others, we had a brief discussion on this general issue before, Joan, and that had to do with the way this is worded, allowing 300-foot travel distances, what keeps

me from taking modern IBC 2000 building and reconfiguring or deleting a staircase to save some money and gain additional work if when I remodel my building under the existing building code.

I can understand the desire to do this in pre-BOCA buildings.

MS. STOGIS: What you're suggesting is we need the work existing to fit in there someplace.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Well, no, I'm not. I'm saying we need a date before which - my concern is making - is doing alterations on buildings built under a more stringent code since our old D.C. codes, and then allowing one to make those, and I know very little about this, so I defer to people like John Devlin and I have a microphone here.

MR. DEVLIN: John Devlin, Chairman of Engineering. Joan, I think there might be a problem. We know where the problem is, the 300 and 350, I think there might be - numbers

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 are incorrect. 2 Under the IBC 2006 in a sprinkler 3 use Group B building, am I not correct in that I can get a 300-foot travel distance? 4 5 sprinklered MS. STOGIS: In а 6 building, my scribbles here say that IBC 7 allows 300. In a non-sprinklered building they allow 200. 8 DEVLIN: hundred, 9 MR. Two 10 question here is was it not the intent of the Committee to address existing buildings pre-11 BOCA, Old D.C. code, and now take advantage of 12 the 300 provided you had sprinklers? 13 And then under IBC for 14 non-15 sprinklered, it would be 200 which under old 16 D.C. building code, pre-BOCA, if memory serves me correctly, it would either have been 125 or 17 150 for non-sprinklered. 18 19 MS. STOGIS: Okay, Ι think we 20 better do a little more work on this one. see what the issues are that we're not trying 21

to give somebody leave to create a super-long

corridor. We're simply trying to allow those 1 which appeared legally in pre-BOCA 2 D.C. 3 buildings to continue to be utilized. 4 MR. DEVLIN: Correct. 5 MS. STOGIS: And let me bring that 6 back, try to work that into it and bring this 7 one back. MR. DEVLIN: 8 Thank you. VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: 9 Are you 10 okay with that, Sydney? You need microphone, I'm sorry. Just let John finish 11 12 and then I'll go to Sydney. 13 MR. DEVLIN: One other item on Exception Number 2, the Fire and Life Safety 14 15 Subcommittee has adopted and brought forth 16 allowing increased travel distance within the dwelling unit, but with 17 respect to the corridor, this would appear to be in conflict 18 19 with the building code. 20 I think what's happening is that part of NFPA 101 which is less restrictive 21 22

being - is

than

IBC

is

to

trying

1	incorporated here, and if we as the Fire and
2	Life Safety Subcommittee looked at this but
3	without going back and completely rewriting
4	means of egress within IBC found it to be a
5	very difficult task.
6	MS. STOGIS: Okay, well we'll take
7	this back and work at it some more with your
8	comments in mind and probably some e-mails.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
10	you. 7.10, oh, I'm sorry, Sydney. I'm sorry
11	Sydney. Thank you. Someone touched the
12	buttons.
13	MR. LESTER: Sydney Lester, DCRA.
14	I also wanted to note - you to note that what
15	I'm with exception to is that what you would
16	end up doing is that for residential for -
17	that for unsprinklered building or the limit
18	now reduces to 175 instead of 200, so you're
19	making the situation even worse by trying to
20	do what you're doing.
21	MS. STOGIS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN:

VICE

22

Thank

1	you.
2	MS. STOGIS: Thank you for the
3	input, and we'll work on this one.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Any
5	other comments on this? Yes, I've got a
6	microphone could be passed to the back please.
7	MR. ANIBADA: Dennis Anibada,
8	DCRA. I think there was an issue also with
9	D.C. Fire Department. The gentleman was here
10	the other day when this thing was introduced,
11	and he mentioned about an issue about the
12	rescue mission as far as the distance, so you
13	need to make sure that they're okay with it
14	about this.
15	MS. STOGIS: Okay, I think our
16	vehicle for doing that would be working with
17	Fire and Life Safety Subcommittee since that
18	has the Fire Department.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
20	you very much. We'll take this up here or you
21	may hold it back there and pass it around the

next requested time. Just don't touch the

buttons. Thank you.

MS. STOGIS: Okay, the next one is EX 7-10, and you should have a - it should say Revision 1 in the little box. There are probably some up at the door if anyone doesn't have that. This amendment covers single-exit buildings - situations of which a single exit is acceptable from an existing building, and what the Existing Building Subcommittee - okay, let's skip to another one. Apparently we don't have -

CHAIRPERSON KARESS: That's all right. Come on back. We need you here. We'll just let this one. Is that all right?

MS. STOGIS: Sure, it might as well hang over along with it. What would be helpful is, let's make sure that the Revision 1 gets circulated by e-mail, and if anyone has comments or finds problems with it, if you could let me know by e-mail ahead of our next meeting, that would help us go through because I think it's in principle it's an important

amendment for D.C. conditions, and I don't want it to kind of keep sliding -

CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Well why don't you let us know what your intent is, excuse me.

MS. STOGIS: Well the intent is really simply adding some provisions for D.C. that came out of our - the tables we had in Chapter 35, Chapter 36, in the 1990s to - for small buildings, existing buildings, to allow singe exits, if the size is limited, the size and occupancy are limited, and frequently with some trade-offs that if it's more feasible for an existing building to provide a modern fire and/or partial full alarm system or sprinklering in lieu of the second exit, that we've - from the 1990s consider that acceptable trade-off in D.C.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: But wouldn't we have the same concern about someone trying to do injustice to a modern building and creating a single-exit building

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

where we didn't have one before?

MS. STOGIS: Well, we've had this in effect probably since the early `90s. Has there been a problem of people taking advantage of it?

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Well the travel - well, I guess I need to defer to the Fire and Life Safety experts in the room, and maybe that can happen during people's review of Revision 1. I know we've got five more minutes before accessibility is on, and I don't want to not respect our schedule.

MS. STOGIS: Okay, let's go on. I hope the rest of these are pretty simple. EX 7-11 is from the 2007 supplement, and I think it's helpful for you to see it allows - the first part 704.1.1 allows a reduction in the corridor fire resistance rating as a trade-off for sprinklering the story where the work area is located, and 705.3.1.2.1 provides details for the use of windows as access to fire escapes.

1	I think these are both provisions
2	which would be very helpful in D.C. I would
3	like to move the adoption of EX 7-11.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
5	you. Do I have a second? Miles Haber is
6	seconding. Any discussion?
7	I had a quick question. Is this
8	actually allowing fire escapes?
9	MS. STOGIS: Fire escapes are
10	allowed in existing buildings, have been
11	throughout the history of the existing
12	building code.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Yes.
14	MS. STOGIS: Generally you have to
15	have a door for access except I believe in
16	residential use where you can have a window
17	but they never defined the size or any of the
18	details of the window.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Somehow
20	I think I know someone that can help me with
21	this, Sydney.
22	MR. LESTER: Sydney Lester, DCRA.

34 When you say fire escapes are allowed in 1 existing buildings, do you mean that existing 2 3 fire escapes are allowed to remain, not that 4 you're allowed to install a new one in an 5 existing building. VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: 6 Because 7 we're not allowed to install a new one. MS. STOGIS: Well, and I'm reading 8 now from the existing building code, where 9 705.3.1.2, fire 10 than one - Section 11 escapes required where more than one exit is 12 required and existing or newly-constructed 13 fire escape complying with Section 705.3.1.2.1 shall be accepted as providing 14 15 one of the required means of egress, and I

believe that's in the 2003 D.C. Supplement.

Then there are a bunch of conditions.

MS. LESTER: Well, I have to check

to see that you're allowed to install a new

one.

17

18

19

20

21

22

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: I was not under the impression that you were

1	permitting new fire escapes.
2	MR. LESTER: No, we have not been
3	allowing new fire escapes.
4	MS. STOGIS: Okay, well this is
5	new. I mean if this is what D.C. wants to
6	achieve, there are no new fire escapes, we
7	need to really - we would really need to
8	modify the ICC whole section here.
9	I guess my question is I think
10	there are situations in D.C. where a building
11	is occupying its full lot or occupying more
12	than zoning permits it to occupy in its lot,
13	and a fire escape is one of the feasible ways
14	of getting you second means of egress.
15	MR. LESTER: But the existing
16	building would have had to require the exit
17	for the existing use, so what you would be
18	doing now is maybe creating a new use where
19	you would need another exit.
20	MS. STOGIS: Not - if it - no,
21	this does not cover change of occupancy.
22	MR. LESTER: So then the existing

building would have had whatever exit it needs.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Or it would allow you to demolish an existing interior exit and put in a fire escape which we don't want.

MR. HABER: Miles Haber. The way I understand it from, you know, national existing building code discussions is they're trying to deal with replacement, and maybe that's the word you need of a fire escape.

Somebody buys a building, renovates it to go condo, but doesn't have room to put in a second interior stair so that they're allowed to build a new - replace the existing fire escape with a new one.

MS. STOGIS: Well it's more than replacement according to the ICC text. One of the requirements says newly constructed fire escapes shall be permitted only where exterior stairs cannot be utilized because of lot lines limiting the stair size or because

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	of sidewalks, alleys, or roads at grade
2	level.
3	MR. HABER: No, that's my
4	understanding.
5	MS. STOGIS: And it is newly
6	constructed. It's not just repair.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: My
8	understand is D.C. is permitting the repair
9	of existing fire escapes. Thank you.
10	MR. HABER: Yes, but I think that,
11	you know, where you haven't had a change in
12	use but you're reconfiguring, you know,
13	inside at some level, Level 2 or something
14	like that, that you could still because you
15	don't have room to put in a second stair.
16	MS. STOGIS: This is so if D.C.
17	wishes to handle this whole issue
18	differently, we need to talk.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
20	you, John Devlin.
21	MR. DEVLIN: Yes, John Devlin,
22	Sherman Engineering. I think what we have to

recognize is that the IEBC why it's written help adaptive reuse of existing building stock, and with that said, there are many buildings that are built on a lot line that the construction of interior an stair per the new requirements would be economically infeasible, and therefore would be contrary to the intent of the IEBC.

What the code is trying to recognize is that when we have change of use, conversion of B to R and urban environment, that the installation of a fire escape that would otherwise be perfectly acceptable if that building were a residential today with a fire escape would be - would not constitute an unsafe condition.

So what the code is trying to do is allow that use of the existing building stock, so I would agree with Joan in what's in there and say that that's not an unreasonable request.

Is it something we would allow for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

any building, no, but it's trying to meet the original mission statement and that is adaptive reuse.

CHAIRPERSON KARESS: I would also like to agree with both you and Joan - Jerrily Karess, and add onto it is a lot of older structures have lost their fire escapes because of various reasons, and to save replacement, I ran that trouble when I had my architectural business.

it a replacement if it once existed once upon a time but isn't right now? I think what we're trying to do is improve safety, and I don't think - and especially in the situations where does not allow any more footprint. I am definitely not for getting rid of some other staircase that exists within the project itself, but if one can add to safety by adding a fire escape on an existing older structure, I don't know why we should refuse that.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Well it
2	sounds like this needs to go back to existing
3	buildings or to Fire and Life Safety and
4	Sydney or some representation from DCRA needs
5	to be a part of the discussion which hasn't
6	been regularly happening to date.
7	MS. STOGIS: Fine, then let's
8	table this.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: And it's
10	three minutes after ,Marc, and can we have
11	another five minutes. I think we can get
12	through the last two amendments. Thank you
13	very much.
14	MS. STOGIS: The next amendment is
15	EX 8-4. This again comes from the 2007
16	Supplement, and it's a one-sentence amendment
17	and it's simply that ICC realized that they
18	had neglected to reference an accessibility
19	section in Chapter 7. I'd like to move the
20	adoption of Amendment EX 8-4.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
22	you, John Devlin is seconding it. Do I have

any discussion on 8-4? Seeing none, we'll call the question. All those in favor, please raise a yellow card. Thank you. All opposed. All abstaining. The motion passes. Thank you.

MS. STOGIS: Ex 8-6 is the second of these cross-references to Chapter 13 of the D.C. Building Code. That's a sustainable and green design. In this case some Level 3 alterations might fall into categories where they would be affected by it. I'd like to move EX - the adoption of EX 8-6.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank Do I have a second? John Devlin. you. Any discussion on 8-6. I see none. We'll call the question. All those in favor, please yellow card. raise а Thank you. All All opposed. abstaining. The motion carries. Thank you.

MS. STOGIS: EX 9-1 is again a change to Chapter 9, change of occupancy, from the 2007 ICC supplement. There are two

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

parts to it. One - the first one clarifies that - has stated that you can count wood, lathe, and plaster in good condition as part of a corridor enclosure, a means of egress It adds a clarifying sentence to enclosure. be sure we understand the walls, either terminated the underside of a ceiling of equivalent construction or extended underside of the floor or roof above.

The second one is a very clarification that when you're changing to a height for which a higher hazard category that you can use a fire barrier rather than a fire wall which fire wall, а strictly interpreted, would be rather difficult to insert into most existing building situations, so I'd like to move the adoption of EX 9-1.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
you. Do I have a second? Bellur
Ravishankar. Discussion on 9-1. Seeing
none, we'll call the question. All those in

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	favor, please raise a yellow card. Thank
2	you. All opposed. All abstaining. The
3	motion passes. Thank you very much.
4	MS. STOGIS: The last one is EX
5	13-2, and this again, this is the - Chapter
6	13 is the performance compliance section for
7	existing buildings in which you go develop a
8	worksheet where you assign values to
9	different safety factors and can come up with
10	a proposal for brining a building into
11	compliance.
12	It again seemed to be possible
13	that using this procedure you might wind up
14	doing work that constitutes substantial
15	improvement and, therefore, we should have a
16	cross reference to Chapter 13 of the Building
17	Code and that is what this amendment
18	proposes.
19	I'd like to move the adoption of
20	EX 13-2.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
22	you. Do I have a second? Bellur, seconding

1	it, and do I have discussion on 13-2? Seeing
2	none, I'll call the question. All those in
3	favor, please raise a yellow card. Thank
4	you. All opposed. All abstaining. The
5	motion passes. Thank you very much.
6	MS. STOGIS: And then I just have
7	one question for Rebecca and that is EX 13-1
8	which is a housekeeping amendment which you
9	fill in who is the authority having
10	jurisdiction and the date. I believe we
11	passed, but it has not appeared on the passed
12	list.
13	MS. MESTEMACHER: Yes, 13-1 has
14	been voted on and passed.
15	MS. STOGIS: Good, so that I think
16	completes existing structures with exception
17	of those that you wanted to work on further.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Yes,
19	John.
20	MR. DEVLIN: John Devlin, Sherman
21	Engineering. I know we had tabled EX 7-10.1.
22	I wasn't paying attention when it came up,

but I'd like to go on the record or if we want to open it back up. Joan and I did discuss this with respect to the single-exit stair and increasing the travel distance.

The reason we looked at this and I just want to note that I am in favor of the change. The reason is that what this is doing is the current code limits travel distance, the exit access, distance to the exit in that space to 75 feet.

That is an arbitrary number. the code requires with a single exit is that each floor will be separated by construction and the exist stair itself will be at least one hour fire resistance rating, so that the exposure of the person in that floor increasing to 25 feet is not unreasonable risk, and it bodes better for smaller buildings where have existing we stock with floor plates of 3,000 to 4,000 square feet, and it's а more reasonable approach of achieving code compliance,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	that's where the requirements - I should say
2	the - why me personally in speaking with Joan
3	on behalf of the Fire Safety Subcommittee
4	felt that it was not an unreasonable request
5	and was in keeping with the intent of the
6	IEBC.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Well
8	thank you. I know that Joan is going to be
9	meeting with Sydney, and I guess it would be
10	helpful to have one of your fire engineers as
11	part of that, and I know you're not available
12	until early November.
13	Who would like to -
14	MR. DEVLIN: Actually if I could,
15	and I'll volunteer him, Steve Hill.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: There
17	you go. Thank you Steve for volunteering.
18	Thank you, Joan.
19	MS. STOGIS: Okay.
20	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: I love our
21	volunteer system.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: With

apologies to the accessibility people, it's ten after 11. We'd hoped to look at these additional accessibility amendments starting at 11, so I'll invite Samantha McAskill, the Chair of the Subcommittee to go over these additional amendments.

MS. MCASKILL: Samantha McAskill,
ASID, Accessibility Subcommittee, and you're
forgiven. We appreciate your delaying the
Accessibility Subcommittee amendments so that
all of our members could get here this
morning.

We only have six amednments. A-1, the majority of our amendments that are remaining were previously approved during the last cycle, during the last two cycles actually, and I will make note of that as we go through the amendments.

A-1 which is changed only to include Appendix E is part of the scoping which deals with accessibility except for E-110 Airport since the District does not have

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

a jurisdiction over the airport.

Also to change the language from physically disabled persons to with physical disabilities which is the more common language in the rest of the code and elsewhere, so I would move approval of A-1.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank you. Do I have a second? Bellur Ravishankar. Discussion on A-1. Seeing none, I'll call the question. All those in favor, please raise your yellow card. Thank you. All opposed. Any abstentions? I see none opposed, none abstaining. The motion passes. Thank you.

MS. MCASKILL: Next we have A-5 which we have revised actually just to improve the language to code language hopefully. We have worked with our accessibility contact at ICC on this, and this is the amendment where we have incorporated the requirement of powered or powered assisters for buildings with an occupant load of greater than 200 in

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

order to assist those with upper body
disabilities or lack of upper body strength,
and I'd like to call to your attention in the
justification that GSA is now requiring in GSA
buildings, some leased buildings, power or
power assisters, so I think that we are a
little bit ahead of our time, but that time is
coming in the code as well.
So I would like to move approval of
A-5.
VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
you. Do I have a second? Thank you, Marc
Fiedler. Discussion on A-5 revised? Yes, I'm
afraid I've lost track of a microphone.
MR. HABER: Yes, Miles Haber.
Samantha, again, memories, I can't remember.
Did we say that this would be applicable to R-
2 buildings as well as, you know, commercial
buildings?
MS. MCASKILL: We did not actually
discuss types of buildings when we discussed
this previously. What we discussed was the -

1	MR. HABER: The population.
2	MS. MCASKILL: Yes, the size of the
3	buildings, not the type of buildings, and
4	during the last BCAC where this was discussed,
5	the 200 occupancy was established as a higher
6	level than we had started in order to begin
7	the process of implementing this and see how
8	it worked, but, no, we did not relegate it to
9	a type of building.
10	MR. HABER: Okay, so that an
11	apartment building with a occupant load of
12	over 200 would have this - have at least one?
13	MS. MCASKILL: Yes, as written now
14	it would.
15	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
16	you, other discussion? Bellur had - could you
17	pass the microphone back to Bellur.
18	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Bellur
19	Ravishankar. I just want to ask you, this is
20	- can this be retroactive or when they do the
21	work on existing buildings which has an
22	occupant load of 200 or more?

1	MS. MCASKILL: Our intent was not
2	to make it retroactive but only for new
3	construction?
4	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Why not? Why
5	can't they be retroactive depending on the
6	level of alteration repair work that they do?
7	MS. MCASKILL: We will certainly -
8	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Joan can
9	answer that question very clearly.
LO	MS. STOGIS: I'll try because we
11	did discuss this with the Accessibility
12	Committee I guess a little bit this time but
L3	actually in the previous cycle when this idea
L 4	was introduced, and - I'm sorry, Joan Stogis.
L5	What we came up with as, and I
L6	believe it's an amendment that was passed, is
L7	that when the work area includes the main
L 8	entrance, then you would comply, but we though
L9	there are situations like you're doing tenant
20	work in a building upstairs.
21	Well the tenant who is having the
22	work done has no control over the front

entrance, so it seemed that as desirable though it might be, it was to difficult to see how you could apply it.

MS. MCASKILL: That is correct that with the existing structures we did agree with

MR. RAVISHANKAR: Well, I haven't been here for too long, I don't think people would touch different door because if your point is as long as you don't touch the front door, you don't have to comply. Even though they can do the work in the lobby area and the rest of the places, as long as they don't touch the main entrance door to the building, that means you're telling - you don't have to worry about this.

MS. STOGIS: I don't have the exact phrasing in front of me, but I believe it was - I don't think it's the door, I think it's the main lobby, but also in my experience of going downtown, the office building owners are frequently redoing the lobby, the main

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

entrance, the main floor, the signage to get a more up-to-date, jazzy view, and I can't image that anyone would leave a tired old door there when they're trying to reposition the building to attract the best quality tenants.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: These are great questions, Bellur, and I will say from my limited personal experience in working on a number of older buildings, I have been asked by the owners of banks, synagogues, and churches to add this refinement where it's certainly not required to do simply because they're trying to project a more open image and allow as many people in as feasible.

MR. RAVISHANKAR: I mean that's appreciated, people who is doing it on a voluntary basis, but I still strongly feel, I think Level 3, Level 4, whatever the Level 3 work they do, I think we should be able to make them install these things in spite of -whether they do the lobby part or the main door part.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Well this would be an amendment to the existing structures code, and maybe Joan can get your input if it's not clear enough already, and we can ask for a response at a future meeting. It wouldn't end up being this part of the code I don't think. Is that okay?

MR. RAVISHANKAR: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank you. Any other comment on A-5 revised? Seeing none, let's call the question. All those in favor, please raise a yellow card. Thank you. All opposed. All abstaining. I see none abstaining and none opposed. The motion carries. Thank you.

MS. MCASKILL: That takes us to A-7 which we have revised only to add additional justification for A-7.

It was - this amendment was previously approved during the last code cycle and it's currently part of the 2003 D.C. Code Supplement.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

What it does is it increases number of accessibility units in prisons and have additional information jails, and we about the number of disabled prisoners as well older prisoners and increasing as significantly and expect that to happen more in the future, and so we would like to maintain the current D.C. Code requirement as the percentage of accessible units as is five percent, so Ι would approval of A-7 as revised.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank you. Do I have a second? Bellur is seconding it. Do I have discussion on A-7 revised? Did you have something, John? Thank you. Our Chair, Jerrily Karess.

CHAIRPERSON KARESS: I'd just like to make a comment. I think that as things continue the accessibility needs, and as you pointed out here, to take into account the aging population which is now falling into some of the very - not falling, excuse me,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	becoming in need of the very same kinds of
2	things that we've been working for in
3	accessibility all this time. Just a comment.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
5	you. Any other comment on A-7 revised?
6	Seeing none, we'll call the question. All
7	those in favor, please raise a yellow card.
8	Thank you. All opposed. All abstaining. I
9	see no opposed, no abstaining. The motion
10	passes. Thank you.
11	MS. MCASKILL: A-8, this amendment
12	was approved during the previous code cycle
13	and is currently part of the 2003 D.C. Code
14	Supplement and also part of ADA and ABA
15	Accessibility Guidelines.
16	It further defines dispersion of
17	accessible dwelling and sleeping units in R-1
18	which is transient housing such as hotels and
19	motels.
20	So I move acceptance of A-8.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
22	you. Do I have a second? Marc Fiedler is

seconding it. Do I have discussion on A-8? 1 2 Seeing none, we'll call the question. 3 All those in favor, please raise 4 the yellow card. Thank you. All opposed. 5 All abstaining. No opposed, no abstaining. 6 The motion carries. Thank you. 7 MS. MCASKILL: Next, A-10, this 8 amendment was also approved during previous code cycle and is currently part of 9 10 the 2003 D.C. Code Supplement. It has also been part of the D.C. Building Code since at 11 1992 as 12 far as the percentages 13 accessible units that are contained in this amendment. 14 15 Ιt essentially increases the 16 quantity of accessible units in multi-family housing and requires one percent or at least 17 18 one roll-in shower. Dispersion is also more 19 fully defined in 1107.6.2.3. 20 So I move approval of A-10 in order to maintain the level of accessibility 21

multi-family housing in the District as it is

1	currently.
2	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
3	you. Do I have a second? Bellur is seconding
4	it. Do I have discussion on A-10 please?
5	Miles would like the microphone.
6	MR. HABER: We agree with this and
7	have a companion. Just to point that
8	1107.6.2.3 should be underlined when you do
9	the amendments so that people understand that
10	it isn't in IBC. It's a D.C. amendment.
11	MS. MCASKILL: Thank you.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
13	you. Any additional discussion on A-10? I
14	see none, let's call the question. All those
15	in favor, please raise a yellow card. Thank
16	you. All opposed.
17	MS. MCASKILL: And before we move
18	away -
19	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: All
20	abstaining.
21	MS. MCASKILL: Oh, excuse me.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: The

1	motion passes. Thank you very much.
2	MS. MCASKILL: Before we move away
3	from this one, would we like to consider the
4	amendment that residential subcommittee?
5	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Yes, my
6	problem is I don't know that we have
7	distributed -
8	MS. MCASKILL: Okay.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: We'll
10	bring it back next time that R-10 is part of
11	A-10. We'll remember. Maybe what we could
12	do, Rebecca, would be to photocopy A-10 onto
13	R-10 so that people can see fully what we're
14	doing. Thank you, A-11.
15	MS. MCASKILL: And our last
16	amendment, A-11, it was approved during the
17	previous code cycle and is currently part of
18	2003 D.C. Code Supplement. It is consistent
19	with current ADA standards for accessible
20	design as far as wheelchair spaces is
21	concerned, so we move approval of A-11.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN:

VICE

22

Thank

1	you. Do I have a second. Mohammed Ali is
2	seconding it. Any discussion on A-11? The
3	Chair has a quick question for Samantha. When
4	you say it meets ADA, are you referring to the
5	ADA that's in effect or the future ADA?
6	MS. MCASKILL: The ADA that's
7	currently in effect and that is currently law.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Why would
9	- I thought the ICC Codes had tried to
10	harmonize. Why would this not be harmonizing?
11	MS. MCASKILL: They have tried very
12	hard which is why our amendments have gone
13	down significantly, but there are certain
14	areas where they're still not harmonized
15	completely.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
17	you, sorry to extend this. Any other
18	comments? Seeing none, let's call the
19	question. All those in favor of A-11, please
20	raise a yellow card. Thank you. All opposed.
21	All abstentions. No abstentions, none
22	opposed, the motion carries. Thank you,

1	Accessibility Subcommittee.
2	MS. MCASKILL: Thank you. One
3	clarification, we do not have an A-12. We did
4	previously and decided it was not necessary,
5	so we do not have an A-12 to submit.
6	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
7	you. Does this complete your amendments for
8	this code cycle?
9	MS. MCASKILL: This does complete
10	our amendment for this cycle.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
12	you, Don, for showing up, for coming to our
13	meeting today, and, Marc, thank you. I know
14	the effort that both of you have to make to
15	get here is great, and you're welcome to hang
16	around for the continuing high-interest
17	amendments that are coming up.
18	Thank you, everyone. It's 11:25,
19	and, John Devlin, we have two amendments that
20	we could vote on today, 12 and 26, but my
21	sense from our discussion at the Fire and Life
l	

Safety Committee meeting earlier is that it's

- are those ready for prime time.

I will say to everyone, on your way out of the building today, Fire and Life Safety has gotten to us additional amendments which will be distributed to each of us electronically within the day, and here is a hard copy of them, and I will - maybe while John is thinking about this I will formally introduce amendments FLS-6, FLS-8, FLS-9, FLS-10, FLS-20, FLS-21, and FLS-26, FLS-36, and an unnumbered one at the back dealing with Section 913.

I'm sorry, thank you very much for passing them out, and while I'm introducing them, a quick question for the Chair. My copies show that there are two FLS-9s, and maybe we can get you a microphone and you could help us. A microphone please.

Since I've been introducing them,

John Devlin, the Chair of the Fire and Life

Safety Subcommittee has joined us, and I was

wondering if - my package has two FLS-9s.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	MR. DEVLIN: Yes, John Devlin. The
2	FLS-9 that you will see that does not have a
3	date of proposal in the block, that should be
4	deleted.
5	The FLS-9 that will be put forth in
6	front of the Committee is the one that has
7	date of proposal -
8	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Date of
9	proposal 17 October.
10	MR. DEVLIN: Correct.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
1 0	you. Does everyone see that in your package?
12	you. Does everyone see that in your package.
13	Thank you, let's go through 12 and
13	Thank you, let's go through 12 and
13	Thank you, let's go through 12 and 26 which are - 12 is here, and I don't know if
13 14 15	Thank you, let's go through 12 and 26 which are - 12 is here, and I don't know if 26 has been further revised.
13 14 15 16	Thank you, let's go through 12 and 26 which are - 12 is here, and I don't know if 26 has been further revised.  MR. DEVLIN: It will, actually it's
13 14 15 16	Thank you, let's go through 12 and 26 which are - 12 is here, and I don't know if 26 has been further revised.  MR. DEVLIN: It will, actually it's going to - a section of it is going to be
13 14 15 16 17	Thank you, let's go through 12 and 26 which are - 12 is here, and I don't know if 26 has been further revised.  MR. DEVLIN: It will, actually it's going to - a section of it is going to be deleted.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Thank you, let's go through 12 and 26 which are - 12 is here, and I don't know if 26 has been further revised.  MR. DEVLIN: It will, actually it's going to - a section of it is going to be deleted.  VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank

1	actually changed. It actually should be -
2	what was in FLS-12 has now been picked up by
3	the new FLS-10, and actually I guess, Marc,
4	what we really need to do is just delete FLS-
5	12 because that Section 911.2 has been
6	incorporated into the new FLS-10 that's been
7	_
8	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Which is
9	among the amendments that are handed out today
10	I recall, so we should simply disregard this
11	two-page double-sided sheet and -
12	MR. DEVLIN: No, basically we're
13	saying is we can delete FLS-12.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: But it's
15	right here.
16	MR. DEVLIN: No, no, no. The one
17	that we had introduced on 4 June -
18	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Got it.
19	Thank you.
20	MR. DEVLIN: I'm sorry 20 June `07,
21	that can now be deleted.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank

1	you, thank you. I'll listen more.
2	MR. DEVLIN: On FLS-26 that was
3	tabled 12 October, I'd like to make an
4	amendment to it. Paragraphs 1027.21 and
5	1027.22 should be deleted from this proposal.
6	The Fire and Life Safety
7	Subcommittee will be submitting another
8	proposal specifically addressing those two
9	sections.
10	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Now,
11	John, I have an FLS-26 in my two-page handout
12	and in a multi-page handout that we got off of
13	your computer disc this morning.
14	MR. DEVLIN: Correct.
15	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: This is too
16	confusing. I think we're confusing everyone.
17	It would be easier -
18	MR. DEVLIN: What we'll do is on
19	the FLS-26 that you received today there's new
20	text that people have not seen, so the
21	previous FLS-26, Marc, that was introduced on
22	- and I'd have to defer to Rebecca

1	MS. MESTEMACHER: September 7.
2	MR. DEVLIN: September 7, that needs
3	to be deleted.
4	MR. MESTEMACHER: I mean September
5	14.
6	MR. DEVLIN: Right, that needs to
7	be deleted, and the FLS-26 that was introduced
8	today will supersede it.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Yes, sir,
10	so take this two-page thing and throw it away.
11	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Which is where
12	you started.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Which is
14	where I started.
15	MR. DEVLIN: No, no, we're not
16	going to pass either of these, but don't throw
17	them away. That's what they need to review to
18	vote on later.
19	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: They're
20	in here. They're in what you handed out
21	today.
22	MR. DEVLIN: Correct.

1	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: The revised
2	ones, am I correct -
3	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: The
4	revised -
5	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Ones are being
6	introduced.
7	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: The
8	revised ones are in your packet today, and if
9	this is too confusing, we can postpone -
10	MR. DEVLIN: No, we have to
11	postpone because new language is introduced.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank
13	you. We'll postpone both of these. Apologies
14	for further confusing everyone, but at least
15	now you're as confused as I am.
16	Thank you. Thank you, 12 is in a
17	two-page package. Oh, thank you, Bellur
18	Ravishankar said that 12 is not in the
19	package, and I've responded to say I believe
20	that 12 is in a package - is in a two-page
21	package that we're throwing away. My

apologies to the court reporter, and FLS-12

has become FLS-10. Thank you, Mr. Stovall.

wishing to confuse Not things further, let the of the me ask sense Committee, we have gone to the trouble of printing one other package for you includes issues and policies, Amendment 1 and Amendment 4 which are stapled together, and you'll notice that they start out 4, and the Chair of Amendment as that subcommittee, I believe we can probably seek to pass Amendment 4 which is - I'll describe in a second.

Amendment 1 is Chapter 1 of the Building Code as I said before, and I have not gotten any other items of discussion, addition, or deletion from anybody in the Committee yet.

Esther Bushman, the General Counsel for the Zoning Office, has given me a couple of good comments, however, I just received them an hour ago, so they're not incorporated into this document.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	We can - if it's the sense of the
2	Committee, we can - I will incorporate these
3	small changes and bring this back or I can ask
4	that we pass this today and further amend this
5	document next time.
6	My goal is trying to get as much
7	done, and I also want to be able to get this
8	to DCRA's Legal Review Team, and they asked
9	that they have it two days ago.
10	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: May we do
11	something different? This is my particular
12	version, and my particular comments that I
13	would like to share.
14	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Oh, you
15	still have comments.
16	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: And talk with
17	you about.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Okay.
19	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: But what I
20	would like to do because this is something we
21	need to get to DCRA immediately, if everyone
22	has had a time to read it, can they just give

1	without passing it? Can they just give all
2	the comments to you, and I'd like to give mine
3	to you after this meeting. Can we all just
4	give a comment?
5	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: That's
6	fine, and what I would like -
7	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: And then we
8	will come for a vote on next time.
9	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: What I
10	would like to recommend is that we will vote -
11	we will meet next Wednesday at ten o'clock,
12	and it will be a short meeting, and at that
13	meeting we will be doing two things.
14	We will be introducing a few
15	additional amendments. I know Fire and Life
16	Safety has several, and then we will ask for a
17	vote on issues and Policies 1, and by that -
18	if I could have anyone's comments by Saturday
19	night at midnight, I will be -
20	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: What a
21	gracious man you are.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN:

22

I will be

1	happy to work on this on Sunday so that -
2	because I've got to get this phone book to
3	Rebecca in sufficient time to be able to
4	reproduce this large volume of paper.
5	With that goal then, I will sit
6	down with the Chair, and I know Esther has
7	given me some comments that I need to consider
8	also, and we will vote on IMP-1 next Wednesday
9	which will probably be a very short meeting.
10	Bellur has a comment. Who has the
11	microphone please? Just pass it back please.
12	Thank you.
13	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Bellur
14	Ravishankar, DCRA. I just want to ask you,
15	Marc, is this the entire Chapter 1?
16	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Yes.
17	MR. RAVISHANKAR: Okay.
18	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Do you also
19	all have the Appendix K?
20	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Yes,
21	that's the first three pages. The first two
22	pages of this is Appendix K. With the

permission or the agreement of the Committee,
I would like to move that we adopt Issues and
Policies Number 4 which is a Calendar Year
1869 document that gives the City guidance on
numbering buildings and has been in the
Building Codes since my memory in the early
`60s.

CHAIRPERSON KARESS: I will second that, and I would also say that there's a few typos I'd like to take care of, but that the essence is obviously beyond our control anyway. It's a matter of including it in our codes.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Thank apologize for the Committee you. Ι missing the typos. Any comment on Issues and Policies Number 4? Seeing none, we'll call the question. All those in favor, please raise a yellow card. Thank you. All opposed. Any abstentions? The motion carries. you very much.

Additional business, as I mentioned

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to a couple of you, there was a quite an interest for very good reasons in our sustainment amendments, and the Subcommittee has met at least once and is recrafting their amendments.

My hope is that those will be introduced on the  $24^{\rm th}$ , and they will be voted on at a meeting following that which I'm hoping would be the  $31^{\rm st}$  of October, and being Halloween which I think would be a great goal to shoot for completing our work. Everyone comes with -

CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Can we come with masks?

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: And however, as I was mentioning to the Fire and Life Safety Committee earlier today, I realize that in this enormous push to try to meet the City's goal of having a new code introduced to the City Council by the beginning of the next calendar year, we have had to do some things in quite a hurry, and I can see that we might

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	have to meet once or twice after the 31st of
	nave to meet once of twice after the 31 of
2	October, but they would more than likely be
3	for very short meetings, and I would
4	appreciate your patience and help in this
5	because I need nine of us present to conduct
6	business.
7	With that, I would ask that we turn
8	in the yellow cards, and before adjourning ask
9	for any comments from the audience from the
10	microphone.
11	MS. MADDOX-LEVINE: Thank you, T.
12	Maddox-Levine, General Counsel's Office, DCRA.
13	I just - I was tasked with the question about
14	the redline, and I appreciate your comments
15	and that you all are trying to move that
16	forward, but I didn't quite understand when we
17	might have a redlined copy to review.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: Well we
19	have been giving sections to Jill Stern, and
20	we've received no feedback, so -
21	CHAIRPERSON KARESS: Yes, and

redlining is a tough word. We don't work that

way. If you take a look at how we work, this is how we work which is we make change and then we insert it in the text.

I think we got somehow some wording misconstrued somewhere. We need to chat, and let's do it after this meeting on what you're looking for, but basically I think one of the big things you should be working on which is 99 percent there is the Chapter 1 which is where most of the OAG counts came before, and secondarily, I think these are more helpful than whatever is called redlining because we don't do it because it explains what we're doing and why.

So somehow we got caught onto a redlining word that I'm not sure any of us know what it means, but if you talk to me after this, we'll get it straightened out.

VICE CHAIRMAN FETTERMAN: And T will say also that the comments — when I went through Chapter 1 there would be comments in there from the Office of the Attorney General

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	once, but then a similar issue would happen
2	later on, and it wasn't picked up, and I tried
3	to do word searching to be as thorough as I
4	could, but I found the comments to be very
5	confusing at times, and we've certainly done
6	our best to try to adopt every possible one
7	because we're trying to make our life as easy
8	as possible for the D.C. Government.
9	Any other comments from the
10	audience? Thank you, I'll see you next
11	Wednesday for a short meeting at ten o'clock.
12	Thank you very much.
13	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was
14	concluded at 11:47 a.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701